1		
2		
3		
4		
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
6	WESTERN DISTRICT COOKT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
7	ATTACOMA	
8	PATTY M. FIRTH,	ı
9	Plaintiff,	CASE NO. C15-5738 BHS
10	v.	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO AMEND AND
11	ZONE FUNDING, et al.,	DISMISSING COMPLAINT
12	Defendants.	
12 13	Defendants.	
		Plaintiff Patty Firth's ("Firth") motion to
13		Plaintiff Patty Firth's ("Firth") motion to
13 14	This matter comes before the Court on	
13 14 15	This matter comes before the Court on amend complaint (Dkt. 19).	ted Defendants' motion to dismiss and
13 14 15 16	This matter comes before the Court on amend complaint (Dkt. 19). On December 17, 2015, the Court grant	ted Defendants' motion to dismiss and Okt. 16. On December 31, 2015, Firth filed
13 14 15 16 17	This matter comes before the Court on amend complaint (Dkt. 19). On December 17, 2015, the Court grant granted Firth leave to amend her complaint.	ted Defendants' motion to dismiss and Okt. 16. On December 31, 2015, Firth filed arguments that courts have repeatedly
13 14 15 16 17 18	This matter comes before the Court on amend complaint (Dkt. 19). On December 17, 2015, the Court grant granted Firth leave to amend her complaint. It a motion to amend. Dkt. 19. Firth raises two	ted Defendants' motion to dismiss and Okt. 16. On December 31, 2015, Firth filed arguments that courts have repeatedly gues Mortgage Electronic Registration
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	This matter comes before the Court on amend complaint (Dkt. 19). On December 17, 2015, the Court grant granted Firth leave to amend her complaint. Date a motion to amend. Dkt. 19. Firth raises two concluded fail to state a claim. First, Firth arg	ted Defendants' motion to dismiss and Okt. 16. On December 31, 2015, Firth filed arguments that courts have repeatedly gues Mortgage Electronic Registration tion of her loan constitutes a violation of the

allege harm as a result of this involvement. Firth has failed to allege resulting harm in any of her numerous complaints in federal or state court. Therefore, the Court denies leave to amend this claim because it is futile. Second, Firth raises the "show me the note" argument. Courts have routinely held that this "show me the note" argument lacks merit. Wallis v. IndyMac Federal Bank, et al., 717 F. Supp. 2d 1195, 2000 (W.D. Wash. 2010) (citing cases). Therefore, the Court denies leave to amend this claim because it is futile and **DENIES** Firth's motion. Firth's complaint and claims are **DISMISSED** with prejudice, and the Clerk shall close this case. Dated this 4th day of February, 2016. United States District Judge